

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**

ALLOWED REVIEW**Applicati n
Number**
09/672,898**Art Unit**
3641**Notice of
Allowance**
24-Mar-03**Examiner**
THOMSON, MICHELLE R**Reviewer**
Baldwin, Robert**Omitted Rejections**

Is there a potential clear error for omitting a rejection? (The rejection you propose must be reasonable)

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, check all that apply

- ☒ 35 U.S.C. 102
- ☐ 35 U.S.C. 103
- ☐ 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, written description
- ☐ 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, enablement
- ☐ 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph
- ☐ 35 U.S.C. 101 (utility)
- ☐ 35 U.S.C. 101 (non-statutory subject matter)
- ☐ Double Patenting (statutory, ODP)
- ☐ Other (e.g., Best Mode)

ALLOWED REVIEW

Applicati n Number

09/672,898

N tice Of All wance

24-Mar-03

Reviewer

Baldwin, Robert

Section III: 35 U.S.C. 102

Correctness of 35 U.S.C 102 Rejections

Were all 35 U.S.C 102 rejections reasonable?

☐ Yes ☐ No

(No indicates potential clear error)

If no, indicate the problem (check all that apply)

- ☐ Claimed features not found in the reference.
- ☐ Wrong subsection of 35 U.S.C. 102 used.
- ☐ Date of the reference no good.
- ☐ Inherency applied improperly.
- ☐ Improper official notice.
- ☐ Other

Comments:

Clarity of 35 U.S.C 102 Rejections

Were all 35 U.S.C. 102 rejections formulated in a clear manner?

☐ Yes ☐ No

(No indicates potential clear error)

Were claim limitations matched to the art?

☐ Yes ☐ Sometimes ☐ No

Was any statement of inherency clearly explained?

☐ Yes ☐ Sometimes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Comments:

35 U.S.C 102 Rejection(s) That Should Have Been Made

Give a brief description of the proposed 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection(s) that should have been made:

Claim 6 is fully readable on Winston (4,966,365) which shows (see, i.e., FIG. 5) a device comprising: (a) a plurality of cloth shot bags 68 connected to each other; and (b) metal shots 44 provided in each of the bags. Inasmuch as the Winston device is inherently capable of being packed in a shell and fired from a large caliber firearm, the instant claimed structure fails to define over such device. Collanus et al (4,729,279) is noted of interest simply to show an example of a large caliber firearm.

Origin of Prior Art used in the proposed 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection(s) above

☐ of record

☒ not of record (attach search logic/documentation)

☒ East

☐ EPO

☐ Other

☐ West

☐ JPO

☐ NPL

☐ Derwent

Comments:

Winston (4,966,365) was found using the search logic: --- metal\$3 same shot and (bags or compartments) and (cloth or fabric) --- [111 hits].

ALLOWED REVIEW**Application Number**

09/672,898

Notice Of Allowance

24-Mar-03

Reviewer

Baldwin, Robert

SECTION XI: File Wrapper**Reasons for Allowance (R/A)**

Did the Examiner write a Reasons for Allowance (R/A)?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

If yes,

Is the R/A clear and complete?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If no,

Does the record as a whole indicate a R/A was necessary?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Comments:

--

Interviews

Was there an interview regarding the merits of the case relevant to the action reviewed?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes,

Was Summary Form PTOL-413 completed?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Is the record of the interview clear and complete?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

--

Claims

Were claims treated in an inappropriate manner on non-substantive issues?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes,

☐ claims are present that were not addressed.☐ claims previously withdrawn from consideration should have been cancelled.☐ improper dependent claims were not properly treated.☐ other

Comments:

--

Sequence Rules

Does the application contain nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes,

Did the examiner properly handle Sequence Compliance Issues?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

--

ALLOWED REVIEW**Applicati n Number**

09/672,898

N tice Of Allowance

24-Mar-03

Reviewer

Baldwin, Robert

Section XIII. Other Issues

Were all claims for priority properly treated?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

If a restriction was made, was it proper?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

Were all matters of substance in applicant's response and affidavits/declarations evaluated sufficiently?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Other issues?

☐ Yes ☒ No

--

Comments:

--

ALLOWED REVIEW

Applicati n Number 09/672,898	N tice Of All wance 24-Mar-03	Reviewer Baldwin, Robert
---	---	------------------------------------

Baldwin, Robert

Section XIV: Indicia of Commendable/Outstanding

Patentability Determination: Indicia of Commendable/Outstanding☐ Yes**Action Taking: Indicia of Commendable/Outstanding**☐ Yes

Patent Examining Function: Indicia of Commendable/Outstanding

[illegible]

ALLOWED REVIEW

Application Number

09/672,898

Notice Of Allowance

24-Mar-03

Reviewer

Baldwin, Robert

Search

Initial Data Capture Points

Was art provided from an ESS before first action?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Was any IDS improperly treated?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

Was a text search performed by the Examiner?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Was it non-patent literature?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Is the search strategy printout present?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

Was the inventorship searched by the Examiner?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If any TC or specialized art has identified specific search requirements in addition to or in exclusion of the above requirements, were these specific requirements complied with?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

Were foreign patent documents cited by the Examiner on an 892?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Were NPL documents cited by the Examiner on an 892?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Did the Examiner perform a new search in a 2nd/subsequent action?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

Did the Examiner update all searches in a subsequent action?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Did an ESS submit a new search report in a 2nd/subsequent action?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Was there new art found by the Examiner that was applied in a 2nd/subsequent action?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Has a search been performed by the Reviewer?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Overall Rating of the Search

☐ Adequate

☒ Less than Adequate

Comments:

Adequate text search would have found Winston (4,966,365) patent.